Claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over Thyssen in view of Kim. The Examiner cited Thyssen column 9, lines 58-65 for updating LP coefficients with a sub-frame for synthesis.

Applicant replies that Thyssen column 9, lines 58-65 does not suggest updating LP coefficients within a sub-frame of the waveform coder; rather, the filter updating (column 9, line 62) is the filter memory, not the filter coefficients. Indeed, Thyssen Table 1 (spanning columns 9-10) indicates 4 sub-frames per frame but only one LSF quantization of 28 bits and one LPC interpolation of 2 bits (Table 1 entry lines 6-7) per frame. In contrast, Thyssen Table 1 entry line 12 indicates an excitation of 31 bits every sub-frame. Consequently, claim 1 is not suggested by the references.

The new claims add some detail and a method for the device of claim 1.

Mistakes in the specification found by the Examiner have been corrected. In particular, the terms "aperiodic" and "nonperiodic" were replaced with "non-periodic", which is the term of choice by the Word dictionary. The "heuristic" nature of the drawings merely notes that the drawings are not to scale and are description aids.